DOES THE TRADEMARK DILUTION CAUSE OF ACTION MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE

November 8, 2008





Dilution Statutes

- 15 U.S.C. 1125(c)
- 37 State Statutes

VICTORIA'S SECRET

- Supreme Court holding that Federal Trademark Dilution Act (FTDA) unambiguously requires a showing of actual dilution rather than a likelihood of dilution. Moseley v. V Secret Catalog, Inc. (2003)
- Led to enactment of FTDRA requiring showing of likelihood of dilution

FTDRA 15 U.S.C 1125(c)

 "the owner of a famous mark that is distinctive ... shall be entitled to an injunction against another person who, at any time after the owner's mark has become famous, commences use of a mark or trade name in commerce that is **likely to cause** dilution by blurring or dilution by tarnishment of the famous mark, regardless of the presence or absence of actual or likely confusion, of competition, or of actual economic injury."

DILUTION ELEMENTS OF PROOF

 ownership of a famous mark that is widely recognized by the general consuming public

 Subsequent use by defendant of a mark or trade name that is likely to cause dilution by blurring or tarnishment of the famous mark

FAME

 "A mark is famous if it is widely recognized by the general consuming public of the United States as a designation of source of the goods or services of the mark's owner."

Fame Factors

- (i) The duration, extent, and geographic reach of advertising and publicity of the mark, whether advertised/publicized by the owner or third parties
- (ii) The amount, volume, and geographic extent of sales of goods or services offered under the mark.
- (iii) The extent of actual recognition of the mark
- (iv) Whether the mark was registered on the Principal Register

Dilution by Blurring Defined

 "association arising from the similarity between a mark or trade name and a famous mark that impairs the distinctiveness of the famous mark."

15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(B)

Blurring Factors

- (i) The degree of similarity between the mark or trade name and the famous mark
- (ii) The degree of inherent or acquired distinctiveness of the famous mark.
- (iii) The extent to which the owner is engaging in substantially exclusive use of the mark.
- (iv) The degree of recognition of the famous mark.
- (v) Whether the user of the mark or trade name intended to create an association with the famous mark
- (vi) Any actual association between the mark or trade name and the famous mark

DILUTION BY TARNISHMENT

"association arising from the similarity between a mark or trade name and a famous mark that harms the reputation of the famous mark." 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(C).

DILUTION REMEDIES

Injunctions

In an action brought under this subsection, the owner of the famous mark shall be entitled to injunctive relief as set forth in section 1116

DILUTION REMEDIES

- Damages
- The owner of the famous mark shall also be entitled to (monetary relief) if
 - (1) the Defendant's mark or trade name was first used in commerce after October 6, 2006; and
 - (2) the Defendant willfully intended to trade on the recognition of the famous mark;

Dilution Remedies for Pre Oct. 6, 2006 Cases

- Likelihood of Dilution Standard applies to claims for injunctive relief
- Actual Dilution Standard applies to claims for damages.

DILUTION DEFENSES

 Any fair use, including a nominative or descriptive fair use, or facilitation of such fair use, of a famous mark by another person other than as a designation of source for the person's own goods or services

DILUTION DEFENSES

 Any fair use, including a nominative or descriptive fair use, or facilitation of such fair use, of a famous mark by another person other than as a designation of source for the person's own goods or services

Dilution Defenses (cont'd)

including use in connection with---

- (i) advertising or promotion that permits consumers to compare goods or services; or
- (ii) identifying and parodying, criticizing, or commenting upon the famous mark owner or the goods or services of the famous mark owner

PARODY

 Can dilution liability be avoided if an alleged parody is used as a source identifying trademark?

Parody Not a Defense

"the claim of parody is not really a separate 'defense' as such, but merely a way of phrasing the traditional response that customers are not likely to be confused as to source, sponsorship or approval"

Schieffelin & Co (S.D.N.Y. 1989)

Parody – Question of Law

"[W]hether a work is a parody is a question of law, not a matter of public majority opinion.".

Mattel, Inc (9th Cir. 2001)

Parody vs. Confusion

 "A nonconfusing parody of a famous mark is not trademark infringement."

Jordache (D.N.M. 1985)

 "[O]ne may not appropriate the entire mark of another and avoid a likelihood of confusion by the addition thereto of descriptive or otherwise subordinate matter".

American Express Co. (E.D.N.Y. 1991)

DILUTION CHECK LIST

- Plaintiff owns a famous mark that has inherent or acquired distinctiveness
- Plaintiff's mark is widely recognized by the general consuming public of the United States as a designation of source
- Defendant uses a mark or trade name that causes blurring or tarnishment of the famous mark
- Defendant began using its mark after the Plaintiff's mark became famous
- Defendant's Use Is Not Fair Use/Parody

FAME CHECK LIST

- Length of time during which the mark has advertised
- Extent or volume of advertising and publicity
- Geographic reach of advertising and publicity by the owner or others
- Volume of sales in dollars and units
- Geographic extent of sales
- Extent to which the mark is actually recognized by the consuming public
- Whether Plaintiff has a Principal Register

BLURRING CHECKLIST

- Degree of similarity between defendant's mark or trade name and famous mark.
- Degree of inherent or acquired distinctiveness of the famous mark.
- Extent to which famous mark is used substantially exclusively.
- Degree of recognition of the famous mark.
- Whether defendant intended to create an association with the famous mark.
- Actual association between the defendant's mark or trade name and the famous mark

TARNISHMENT CHECKLIST

- Degree of association in the minds of the consuming public between the defendant's mark or trade name and the famous mark
- Extent to which association arises from the similarity between the marks
- Extent to which association harms the reputation of the famous mark